UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/806,553	03/23/2004	Michael C. Matti	1105-001U	2556

29973 7590 08/18/2009

CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL LLP
ATTN: STEVEN M. GREENBERG, ESQ.
950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE
SUITE 3020
BOCA RATON, FL 33487

EXAMINER	
PARKER, BRANDON	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2174	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/18/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/806,553	MATTI, MICHAEL C.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BRANDON PARKER	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 May 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7 and 9-42* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7 and 9-42* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1, 33, 35, 37-39 have been amended, claim 8 has been cancelled and claims 1-7 and 9-42 remain pending for examination.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 05/18/2009 in regards to the have been fully considered but they are not persuasive however the rejection under 35 USC 101 has been withdrawn.

Applicant argues Sakaguchi does not explicitly disclose one or more third instructions for loading the web page content as a child, embedded page inside a wrapper page and wherein the third instructions place in front of the web page content the protective component on a computing device's display unit, however Examiner disagrees, Sakaguchi provides a transparent window starting HTML 400 is loaded into the web browser 207, and a transparent window 110 is generated (step 305), the transparent window control unit 209, in which a code of JavaScript operates, invokes a program of the C language through a Java class, and asks the operating system 203 to initiate the process of the transparent window main body 219 wherein the javascript/HTML embedded content (i.e. onload, Fig. 8) and a transparent window is in front of the application (i.e. HTML content/web browser), (Col. 2 lines 4-12, Col. 6 lines 5-42, Fig. 1, Fig. 2). It is apparent the Javascript is embedded in the HTML code. Furthermore Fig. 8 discloses Javascript made available in a HTML wrapper page. There is no difference from the loaded Javascript embedded in the HTML wrapper page of Sakaguchi and the web page "child" as disclosed by the applicant. The term

"child" is referring to the fact that the transparent window is parent because it is the overlaying window. Therefore Sakaguchi discloses a transparent window (i.e. parent) and the application window (i.e. child) as shown in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-7, 9-13, 16-18 and 20-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sakaguchi et al (US Patent 6720982 Hereinafter "Sakaguchi").

Regarding claim 1, Sakaguchi discloses a system for displaying content of a web page to a user on a computing device, wherein the computing device includes a processor to execute instructions, wherein the content includes an interactive interface element for display to a user, comprising: one or more first instructions for generating a protection component to overlay at least a portion of content of the web page;

Sakaguchi discloses if a **button on a browser** (i.e. element from a web page) is pushed, the program corresponding to the button is being executed, the pushing of the particular button or any other button can interrupt that program to execute a different or the same program (Col. 1 lines 15-23) therefore Sakaguchi

provides a **misoperation prevention** method which provides "a **transparent window** main body generated by said operating system; and a transparent window procedure for **instructing** the operating system to **move the transparent window in front** of the **application window/web browser** in response to the detection of a predetermined operation input using the pointing device" (Col. 3 lines 4-7)

one or more second instructions for receiving data indicative of an attempt at user interaction with an element from a web page wherein the overlaid portion covers the element wherein the generated protection component is used in preventing user interaction with the element from the web page

Sakaguchi discloses a **transparent window main body** 219 appears **in front (i.e. overlay) of the application window/web browser** of the target application to **block the operator's input** (i.e. preventing user interaction) to the target application 207/web browser (Col. 5 lines 50-60, Col.2 lines 4-12) . Furthermore, Sakaguchi discloses the "transparent window control HTML 410 is built in the head of a program related to the button for enabling the mouse input blocking control" (Col. 6 lines 33-35) and "if a mouse event occurs in the transparent window 110, a display may be outputted to the effect that any input is not accepted now or an operation procedure for canceling the protection by the transparent window may be displayed" (Col. 6 lines 54-58) to "prevent buttons (i.e. an element from a webpage) other than a predetermined button from being pushed until the process executed by pushing it terminates" (Col. 1 lines 31-33).

Sakaguchi discloses **one or more third instructions for loading the web page content as a child, embedded page inside a wrapper page and wherein the third instructions place in front of the web page content the protective component on a computing device's display unit** (Col. 4 11-28), Note, Sakaguchi provides a transparent window starting HTML 400 is loaded into the web browser 207, and a transparent window 110 is generated (step 305), the transparent window control unit 209, in which a code of JavaScript operates, invokes a program of the C language through a Java class, and asks the operating system 203 to initiate the process of the transparent window main body 219 wherein the javascript/HTML embedded content (i.e. onload, Fig. 8) and a transparent window is in front of the application (i.e. HTML content/web browser), (Col. 2 lines 4-12, Col. 6 lines 5-42, Fig. 1, Fig. 2). It is apparent the Javascript is embedded in the HTML code. Furthermore Fig. 8 discloses Javascript made available in a HTML wrapper page. There is no difference from the loaded Javascript embedded in the HTML wrapper page of Sakaguchi and the web page "child" as disclosed by the applicant. The term "child" is referring to the fact that the transparent window is parent because it is the overlaying window. Therefore Sakaguchi discloses a transparent window (i.e. parent) and the application window (i.e. child) as shown in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2.

Claims 33, 35, 37 and 38 are similar in scope to claim 1 therefore the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

Regarding claim 2, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 1, wherein the protection component shields the web page from interaction with an interface pointing device; wherein instructions are used to prevent keyboard interaction with the web page "a **transparent window main body** 219 appears **in front (i.e. overlay) of the application window/web browser** of the target application to **block the operator's input** (i.e. preventing user interaction), (Col. 5 lines 50-60, Col.2 lines 4-12) to "prevent buttons (i.e. an element/element(s) from a webpage) other than a predetermined button from being pushed until the process executed by pushing it terminates" (Col. 1 lines 31-33)

Regarding claim 3, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 1, wherein the protection component acts as a shield in preventing user interaction with a plurality of elements displayed on the web page "a **transparent window main body** 219 appears **in front (i.e. overlay) of the application window/web browser** of the target application to **block the operator's input** (i.e. preventing user interaction), (Col. 5 lines 50-60, Col.2 lines 4-12) to "prevent buttons (i.e. an element/element(s) from a webpage) other than a predetermined button from being pushed until the process executed by pushing it terminates" (Col. 1 lines 31-33)

Regarding claim 4, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 1, wherein the element is a hyperlink "a **transparent window main body** 219 appears **in front (i.e. overlay) of the application window/web browser** of the target application to **block the operator's input** (i.e. preventing user interaction), (Col. 5 lines 50-

60, Col.2 lines 4-12) to “prevent buttons (i.e. an element/element(s) from a webpage) other than a predetermined button from being pushed until the process executed by pushing it terminates” (Col. 1 lines 31-33)

Regarding claim 5, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 1, wherein the element is a user manipulable control “a **transparent window main body** 219 appears **in front (i.e. overlay) of the application window/web browser** of the target application to **block the operator's input** (i.e. preventing user interaction), (Col. 5 lines 50-60, Col.2 lines 4-12) to “prevent buttons (i.e. an element/element(s) from a webpage) other than a predetermined button from being pushed until the process executed by pushing it terminates” (Col. 1 lines 31-33)

Regarding claim 6, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 1, wherein the element is a web page form control element “a **transparent window main body** 219 appears **in front (i.e. overlay) of the application window/web browser** of the target application to **block the operator's input** (i.e. preventing user interaction), (Col. 5 lines 50-60, Col.2 lines 4-12) to “prevent buttons (i.e. an element/element(s) from a webpage) other than a predetermined button from being pushed until the process executed by pushing it terminates” (Col. 1 lines 31-33)

Regarding claim 7, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 6, wherein the web page form control element is a combo box with which the web page by itself allows a user to interact with the web page form control element in order to select

data provided by the combo box; wherein the protection component renders the web page combo box inoperable to the user "a **transparent window main body** 219 appears **in front (i.e. overlay) of the application window/web browser** of the target application to **block the operator's input"** (i.e. preventing user interaction) to the target application 207/web browser (Col. 5 lines 50-60, Col.2 lines 4-12)

Regarding claim 9, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 1, wherein the third instructions place the protection component as a transparent element (110, Fig. 2) directly in front of the web page content (120, Fig. 2) on a computing device's display unit "a **transparent window main body** 219 appears **in front (i.e. overlay) of the application window/web browser** of the target application to **block the operator's input** (i.e. preventing user interaction), (Col. 5 lines 50-60, Col.2 lines 4-12) to "prevent buttons (i.e. an element/element(s) from a webpage) other than a predetermined button from being pushed until the process executed by pushing it terminates" (Col. 1 lines 31-33)

Regarding claim 10, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 9, wherein size of the transparent element is at least substantially matched to the embedded web page content (Fig. 6)

Regarding claim 11, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 1, wherein the protection component is configured to cover on a computing device's display the displayed web page content such that the user can access a navigation region associated with the web page content "a **transparent window main body** 219

appears **in front (i.e. overlay) of the application window/web browser** of the target application to **block the operator's input** (i.e. preventing user interaction), (Col. 5 lines 50-60, Col.2 lines 4-12)

Regarding claim 12, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 11, wherein the navigation region includes a scroll-up and scroll-down navigation section of the displayed web page content. “a **transparent window main body** 219 appears **in front (i.e. overlay) of the application window/web browser** of the target application to **block the operator's input** (i.e. preventing user interaction), (Col. 5 lines 50-60, Col.2 lines 4-12)

Regarding claim 13, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 1, wherein when interaction with the web page content is attempted by the user, the overlaid protection component presents a message to the user that notifies the user that interface access is being prevented “if a mouse event occurs in the transparent window 110, **a display may be outputted to the effect that any input is not accepted now** or an operation procedure for canceling the protection by the transparent window may be displayed" (Col. 6 lines 54-58) to “prevent buttons (i.e. an element from a webpage) other than a predetermined button from being pushed until the process executed by pushing it terminates” (Col. 1 lines 31-33)

Regarding claim 16, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 1, wherein the web page content is to be displayed through use of a web browser operating on a computing device (Col. 2 lines 4-12)

Regarding claim 17, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 1, wherein the web page content is for display upon a computing device that is capable of displaying web page content to a user (Col. 2 lines 4-12)

Regarding claim 18, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 17, wherein the web page content is for display upon a computer to a user (Col. 4 lines 58-67)

Regarding claim 20, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 1, wherein first instructions are based upon instructions selected from the group of Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) instructions, ActiveX instructions, ASP (Active Server Page) instructions, Java instructions, Javascript instructions, PHP (PHP: Hypertext Preprocessor) instructions, and combinations thereof (Fig. 6-8).

Regarding claim 21, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 1, wherein the first instructions comprise machine code instructions (Col. 4 lines 19-49)

Regarding claim 22, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 1, wherein the first instructions comprise human-readable instructions (Fig. 6-8).

Regarding claim 25, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 1, wherein the web page content and the first and second instructions are provided to a computing device over a network (Col. 4 lines 28-67).

Regarding claim 26, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 25, wherein the network is an internet network (Col. 5 lines 29-37)

Regarding claim 27, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 25, wherein the network is a wide area network or a local area network (18, Fig. 3).

Regarding claim 28, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 25, wherein a network address is associated with the web page content, wherein an obfuscated version of the address is displayed to the user (18, Fig. 3)

Regarding claim 29, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 1, wherein web page instructions indicate how the web page content is to be displayed to a user, wherein the web page instructions allow the element to be manipulated while the element is to be displayed to a user (Fig. 6-7); wherein the preventing of the user interacting with the element by the first instructions does not require modification of the web page instructions **in order to prevent the user interaction with the element** (Col. 6 lines 11-67 Fig. 6-8). The HTML code does not require modification of the web page instructions, the HTML code represents a mouse input blocking control.

Regarding claim 30, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 1, wherein web page Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) instructions indicate how the web page content is to be displayed to a user, wherein the web page HTML instructions allow the element to be manipulated while the element is to be displayed to a user; wherein the preventing of user interaction with the element by the first instructions does not require modification of the web page HTML source code **in order to prevent the user interaction with the element** (Col. 6

lines 11-67 Fig. 6-8) The HTML code does not require modification of the web page instructions, the HTML code represents a mouse input blocking control.

Regarding claim 31, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 1, wherein a storage device, which is remotely located from the computing device and accessible by the computing device over a network, stores the first instructions (Fig. 3)

Regarding claim 32, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 1, wherein a storage device of the computing device stores the first instructions for use by the computing device (Fig. 3)

Regarding claim 34, Sakaguchi discloses a system for displaying content of a web page to a user on a computing device, wherein the computing device includes a processor to execute instructions, wherein the content includes an interactive element for display to a user, comprising: means for generating a protection component to overlay at least a portion of the web page content;

Sakaguchi discloses if a **button on a browser** (i.e. element from a web page) is pushed, the program corresponding to the button is being executed, the pushing of the particular button or any other button can interrupt that program to execute a different or the same program (Col. 1 lines 15-23) therefore Sakaguchi provides a **misoperation prevention** method which provides "a **transparent window** main body generated by said operating system; and a transparent window procedure for **instructing** the operating system to **move the transparent window in front** of the **application window/web browser** in

response to the detection of a predetermined operation input using the pointing device" (Col. 3 lines 4-7)

means for receiving data indicative of an attempt at user interaction with an element from a web page; wherein the overlaid portion covers the element from the web page; means for loading the web page content as a child, embedded page inside a wrapper page, and for placing the protection component in front of the web page content; wherein the generated protection component is used in preventing user interaction with the element from the web page.

Sakaguchi discloses a **transparent window main body** 219 appears **in front (i.e. overlay) of the application window/web browser** of the target application to **block the operator's input** (i.e. preventing user interaction) to the target application 207/web browser (Col. 5 lines 50-60, Col.2 lines 4-12) and "FIG. 6 is a figure showing the HTML for generating the transparent window in the preferred embodiment of the present invention" Col. 3 lines 65-67 discloses loading the web page content as a child, embedded page inside a wrapper page because the HTML/wrapper page "can be configured to load the target web page content within itself and then place on the display, directly in front of the target content". Furthermore, Sakaguchi discloses the "transparent window control HTML 410 is built in the head of a program related to the button for enabling the mouse input blocking control" (Col. 6 lines 33-35) and "if a mouse event occurs in the transparent window 110, a display may be outputted to the effect that any input is not accepted now or an operation procedure for canceling the protection

by the transparent window may be displayed" (Col. 6 lines 54-58) to “prevent buttons (i.e. an element from a webpage) other than a predetermined button from being pushed until the process executed by pushing it terminates” (Col. 1 lines 31-33).

Claim 36 is similar in scope to claim 34 therefore the claim is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 14, 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakaguchi et al (US Patent 6720982 Hereinafter “Sakaguchi”)in view of Smith et al (US Patent 5933141 hereinafter “Smith”).

Regarding claim 14, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 1, wherein when interaction with the web page content is attempted by the user that notifies the user that interface access is being prevented “if a mouse event occurs in the transparent window 110, **a display may be outputted to the effect that any input is not accepted now** or an operation procedure for canceling the protection by the transparent window may be displayed" (Col. 6 lines 54-58) but

does not disclose a visibility characteristic of the overlaid protection component is changed but does provide a mouse input blocking control" (Col. 6 lines 33-35) and "a **transparent window main body** 219 appears **in front (i.e. overlay) of the application window/web browser** of the target application to **block the operator's input** (i.e. preventing user interaction), (Col. 5 lines 50-60, Col.2 lines 4-12).

Smith provides mutatably transparent controls wherein the controls are all opaque until a user moves the pointer over one of the controls then the other two controls are not displayed. It is understood, there **visibility characteristic of the overlaid protection component has changed** from **transparent to opaque** since the two controls has changed from **opaque to transparent** (Col. 2 lines 13-26, Fig. 3A-3D)

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the mutatably transparent controls as taught by Smith with the mouse input blocking control of Sakaguchi to effectively and efficiently prevent accidental/intentional interaction with an element(s)/control(s).

Regarding claim 15, Smith discloses a system of claim 1, wherein the visibility characteristic changes such that the overlaid protection component become more opaque.

Smith provides mutatably transparent controls wherein the controls are all opaque until a user moves the pointer over one of the controls then the other two controls are not displayed.

It is understood, there **visibility characteristic of the overlaid protection component has changed** from **transparent to opaque** since the two controls has changed from **opaque to transparent** (Col. 2 lines 13-26, Fig. 3A-3D).

Regarding claim 19, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 17**,** wherein the web page content is for display/web browser but does not disclose the display upon a personal digital assistant (PDA) device that is capable of displaying web page content to a user but does disclose displaying a web browser on a personal computer (Col. 5 lines 8-36, Col. 4 lines 62-67).

Smith discloses mutatably transparent controls displaying on a personal digital assistant (Col. 3 lines 15-35) which displays a web browser application program (Fig. 5a, 5b).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the PDA's web browser as taught by Smith with the PC's web page to effectively and efficiently display an overlay of a web page.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakaguchi et al (US Patent 6720982 Hereinafter "Sakaguchi")in view of Pasquali et al (US Publication 20040093563 hereinafter "Pasquali").

Regarding claim 23, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 1, wherein the web page content is loaded within a Hypertext Markup Language (Fig. 6-8) but does not disclose page content is loaded within a (HTML) IFRAME element wherein an HTML DIV element is positioned above the IFRAME element and its opacity value is set so as to render the DIV element transparent or at least substantially translucent and capable of preventing user interaction with at least a portion of the web page content.

However Sakaguchi discloses if a button on a browser (i.e. element from a web page) is pushed, the program corresponding to the button is being executed, the pushing of the particular button or any other button can interrupt that program to execute a different or the same program (Col. 1 lines 15-23) therefore Sakaguchi provides a **misoperation prevention** method which provides "a **transparent window** main body generated by said operating system; and a transparent window procedure for **instructing** the operating system to **move the transparent window in front** of the **application window/web browser** in response to the detection of a predetermined operation input using the pointing device" (Col. 3 lines 4-7)

Pasquali discloses a system and method for facilitating a window based content manifestation environment within a www browser and (HTML) IFRAME element wherein an HTML DIV element is positioned above the IFRAME element and its opacity value is set so as to render the DIV element transparent or at least substantially translucent (see code between Par. 0100 and Par. 0100).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the HTML IFRAME element/ as taught by Pasquali with the misoperation prevention method of Sakaguchi to effectively provide a method for preventing user interaction based on the HTML layout.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakaguchi et al (US Patent 6720982 Hereinafter “Sakaguchi”)in view of McNair et al (US Patent 5559505 hereinafter “McNair”).

Regarding claim 24, Sakaguchi provides a **misoperation prevention** method which provides "a **transparent window** main body generated by said operating system; and a transparent window procedure for **instructing** the operating system to **move the transparent window in front** of the **application window/web browser** in response to the detection of a predetermined operation input using the pointing device” (Col. 3 lines 4-7) but does not disclose wherein the user gains access to the web page content so as to be able to interact with the element from the web page based upon password information being provided; wherein access for the user to the web site containing the web page content is barred if the user attempts to access the web page content more than a predetermined number of times.

Mcnair discloses allowing access to the resource if the password is valid, means for allowing the same user to re-attempt access to said resource after a

time interval "t", and means for repeatedly increasing the value of "t" as a function of the number of invalid access attempts by the user (Mcnair Claim 1, Abstract)

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the lockout access method as taught by Mcnair with the mouse input blocking of Sakaguchi to effectively prevent misoperation and further access to a web page.

Claim 39-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakaguchi et al (US Patent 6720982 Hereinafter “Sakaguchi”)in view of Andrew et al (US Patent 6633310 hereinafter “Andrew”).

Regarding claim 39, Sakaguchi discloses a system for displaying content, wherein the computing device includes a processor to execute instructions, wherein the content includes an interactive interface element for display to a user, comprising: one or more first instructions for generating a protection component to overlay;

Sakaguchi discloses if a **button on a browser** (i.e. element from a web page) is pushed, the program corresponding to the button is being executed, the pushing of the particular button or any other button can interrupt that program to execute a different or the same program (Col. 1 lines 15-23) therefore Sakaguchi provides a **misoperation prevention** method which provides "a **transparent**

window main body generated by said operating system; and a transparent window procedure for **instructing** the operating system to **move the transparent window in front** of the **application window/web browser** in response to the detection of a predetermined operation input using the pointing device" (Col. 3 lines 4-7), Sakaguchi does not displaying content of a form to a user on a computing device and a protection component to overlay at least a portion of content of the form but does provide "a **transparent window main body** 219 appears **in front (i.e. overlay) of the application window/web browser** of the target application to **block the operator's input** (i.e. preventing user interaction), (Col. 5 lines 50-60, Col.2 lines 4-12) to "prevent buttons (i.e. an element/element(s) from a webpage) other than a predetermined button from being pushed until the process executed by pushing it terminates" (Col. 1 lines 31-33); Sakaguchi discloses one or more third instructions for loading the web page content as a child, embedded page inside a wrapper page and wherein the third instructions place in front of the web page content the protective component on a computing device's display unit (Col. 4 11-28), Note, Sakaguchi provides a javascript/HTML embedded content (i.e. onload, Fig. 8) and a transparent window in front of the application (i.e. HTML content/web browser), (Col. 2 lines 4-12, Fig. 1, Fig. 2). It is apparent the Javascript is embedded in the HTML code. Furthermore Fig. 8 discloses Javascript made available in a HTML wrapper page. There is no difference from the loaded Javascript embedded in the HTML wrapper page of Sakaguchi and the web page "child" as disclosed by the applicant. The term "child" is referring to the fact that the transparent window is

parent because it is the overlaying window. Therefore Saraguchi discloses a transparent window (i.e. parent) and the application window (i.e. child) as shown in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2.

Andrew provides switchably translucent and opaque graphical user interface elements wherein the elements relate to buttons, radio button, dialog boxes or checkboxes (Col. 5 lines 1, 49-58) which describe a form which describe one or more second instructions for receiving data indicative of an attempt at user interaction with an interface element from the form; wherein the overlaid portion covers the interface element from the form; wherein the generated protection component is used in preventing user interaction with the element from the form.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the checkbox/dialog box form as taught by Andrew with the mouse input blocking method of Sakaguchi to effectively and efficiently prevent selection of an interface element.

Regarding claim 40, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 39, wherein the form is generated from a database product (Col. 4 lines 27-49)

Regarding claim 41, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 39, wherein the form is a web-based form (Col. 7 lines 5-10)

Regarding claim 42, Sakaguchi discloses a system of claim 39, wherein the form is generated in order to interact with a data mining application (Col. 5 lines 5-12)

It is understood that standard operating systems applications interact with the data mining applications.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRANDON PARKER whose telephone number is (571)270-1302. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 730- 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dennis Chow can be reached on 571-272-7767. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brandon Parker
Examiner
Art Unit 2174

/Joshua D Campbell/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178